

25, WILTON PLACE.
S.W.

May 20/70

My dear Gray

Just received yours of the 2^d
which I hasten to answer on account
of the Californian laurel. The polygamous,
certainly not dioecious flower and the
stamens of the 3 orders turned outward
do not agree with *Petrea* (*Petranthera*)
while the involucre take it out of
Ocotea (*Oreodaphne*). Perhaps Nuttall's
genus *Drymoxylum* should be adopted
for it but I leave you to settle whether
to make it a distinct genus closely connecting
two main tribes of Laurineae or
leave it as an anomalous *Petranthera*.

We have not Nuttall's *Glossa* which
somehow we had overlooked so we
had no record of *Drymoxylum* and
it is not in the Prodrromus. Oliver has
taken steps to procure the book.

I have been looking at the Mexican &
other North American *Isotriaetheron* but
they all appear to have ^{all} the stamens
turned inward and to be vicious
by abortion and *Drymophyllum* would
stand alone

The doubtful Mexican *Saurineia* I
mentioned (perhaps by mistake I said *Coulterii*)
is Gregg's n. 314 sent by you in fruit
only the fruit appears to be really
Saurineia but the foliage unlike any
species I know. Have you named it?

As to finishing *Genera Plantarum*
I cannot expect to live through the
Orchidaceae - very thankful if we
finish the *Dicotyledons* before I go

Yours very sincerely

George Bentham

Congratulate you on your new floor
which however has not yet come to hand but with no doubt immediately